

Today's Topics:

(#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters
Aircraft callsigns, etc....
ARRL (3 msgs)
Motorola HT-600 Modifications

Date: 6 Dec 89 01:43:05 GMT

From: unsvox!arrakis.nevada.edu!storkus@uunet.uu.net (Mike Storke (N7MSD))

Subject: (#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplifters

Message-ID: <1094@unsvox.NEVADA.EDU>

Since when did the FCC say that a husband couldn't call his wife (by patch or direct) about getting a loaf of bread or something like that? I have never heard of that, and I'm sure many others haven't either, since I hear it on the radio all the time! Besides, what kind of business is that? That's family matters, not business (unless family business is prohibited as well, which means that we can't say much of anything over the radio!). 73's,

Mike P. Storke, N7MSD NOTICE: Use my HOME QTH address until mid January.

Inet: storkus@arrakis.nevada.edu Packet: KF7TI @ LAS:K7WS-1 or VEGAS:P0T0SI

Snailmail: Box 6 Minden, Nv 89423:HOME QTH. And I claim EVERYTHING I SAY!!

"Pascal: The Handcuff of the programmer. I WANT MY C!!!!!!!!!!!!!!"

Date: Tue, 5 Dec 89 17:34:42 CST

From: dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD)

Subject: Aircraft callsigns, etc....

Message-ID: <8912060003.AA18919@ti.com>

I thought the discussion about this had long since degenerated to a more general discussion of whose political views take precedence; but since more flak has arisen, I'd like to make one more comment, then I'll shut up on the subject:

Those who are really interested in the who's and why's of the aircraft call-signs need only visit their nearest Air Force recruiting office. Sign on the dotted line. Then, you can not only learn all about it, but you can be a part of the action! Afterwards, you can ask curious civilians why they are interested in it: hopefully without flames.

Regards,
Dube Todd

Date: 5 Dec 89 22:24:33 GMT

From: att!cbnewsm!mhgki!rma@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (atkins, robert m)

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <7327@cbnewsm.ATT.COM>

In article <24896@ubvax.UB.Com>, hardwick@ubvax.UB.Com (Bob Hardwick) writes:

>
> Several messages are circulating concerning how-to, or want-to, modify
> VHF or UHF amateur gear for out of band operation. Why anyone would be
> so blatant as to tell someone how, or request to violate the law is
> beyond apprehension. We are not talking about MARS frequencies, but
> allowing amateur gear to transmit in the commercial bands. This is
> clearly unacceptable, and sysops should kill those messages when they
> appear. Locally several individuals have been investigated for operating
> amateur equipment in the public safety and commercial bands. Putting
> your 6 meter radio on 47.42 to help the Red Cross is illegal. Operating
> your Kenwood on a GMRS system or commercial UHF box is illegal.
> Locally we provide the FCC enforcement section call signs of anyone
> requesting how to or trying to stimulate a data base on illegal mods.
> FCC type acceptance is the bottom consideration, as well as common sense.
> We hope the FCC will discuss the appropriate aspects with the individuals
> concerned. It is no wonder that others are able to attack our hobby,
> since we provide them the ammunition to do so.
> Thank you for your consideration on this.
>
> Mike N6KZB @ N6KZB Orange Section ARRL ASM.
> Telecommunications Engineer II, RCOFD.
>
>
> If this is what the ARRL is doing with our dues money then
> the ARRL has just lost a member.

The ARRL has a lot of volunteer helpers who can do as they please without reference to ARRL. So this is probably not ARRL policy, just the views of an ASM. That being said, I agree with the views expressed. I don't care if you like it or not, modification for out of band service (MARS and CAP excepted) seems to be illegal. What gives hams the right to do this? What if everyone started carrying around non-type approved radios on police/fire/etc frequencies. What if CBers start modifying their radios to operate on 10m. Where do you draw the line.

On a related topic:

I'm not sure if the net needs yet another subgroup, but does anyone else think that a radio.scanners catagory would be a good idea?
It could contain:

- Lists of frequencies for police/fast-food/railroads/....whatever
- Mods to convert ham gear to out of band tx/rx
- Discussions of who is allowed to receive what
- Discussions of the merits of various scanners

In short, it could carry the non ham-radio material that this news group carries. Over the last week or so I calculate that >45% of the postings have belonged to such a sub-group and well over 50% of the total text. Perhaps we should rename this group?? The newly formed rec.radio.shortwave might be a better forum but the machine I read the news from does not yet seem to have access to it. Am I alone in thinking this stuff is out of place here? Even though the "CQ PIZZA" saga went on forever, at least it was about ham-radio. I'd even settle for a rec.ham-radio.tech, where I wouldn't have to wade through so much peripheral stuff to find a posting on ham-radio.

Bob Atkins, KA1GT

(NOTE: For those who might miss the point. This is not a real call for yet another newsgroup, but is intended to stimulate discussion on what should be posted to the ham-radio newsgroup).

Date: 6 Dec 89 01:40:02 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
m.cs.uiuc.edu!kenny@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <13900013@m.cs.uiuc.edu>

/* Written 8:18 pm Dec 4, 1989 by hardwick@ubvax.UB.Com in
m.cs.uiuc.edu:rec.ham-radio */
/* ----- "ARRL" ----- */

>Several messages are circulating concerning how-to, or want-to, modify
>VHF or UHF amateur gear for out of band operation. Why anyone would be
>so blatant as to tell someone how, or request to violate the law is
>beyond apprehension.

While I realize that *many* such requests come from people who have
illegal operations in mind, there are several entirely legitimate
purposes that come to mind.

One legitimate reason for such a request is that the requestor plans
to modify a 2m rig to serve as the exciter for a tripler and amplifier
in the 70cm band. An unmodified 2m rig will operate between 144 and
148 MHz; running it through a tripler will give a 432-444 MHz
operation. As any ham over the rank of Novice is supposed to know,
the 70cm band extends from 420-450 MHz; a modification to a 2m rig to
give it the capability to transmit (into a dummy load, or the tripler)
between 140 and 150 MHz will extend the tripled output to cover the
entire 70cm band.

Another possibility is that the requestor plans to operate in a country that has a different spectrum allocation in VHF/UHF than the United States.

In any case, can you cite any law or regulation that is violated by carrying such information on a BBS? Acting on the information is another matter altogether -- but even then, it's perfectly legal for a ham to *possess* equipment that can operate out of band -- the ham simply isn't allowed to operate it in an illegal manner.

I know that I'm going to get flamed, now, for having posted excuses that the illegal operators can use in order to contrive legitimate-sounding requests for out-of-band modifications.
FBOM.

A-T

/	o	Kevin Kenny	KB9DLU/AA	(217) 333-5821
< />	/\	Department of Computer Science		o , o ,
\ X_ \		University of Illinois		40 07 N 88 13 W
kenny@cs.uiuc.edu		1304 W. Springfield Ave.		
uunet!uiucdcs!kenny		Urbana, IL 61801		AD ASTRA PER ARDUA
k-kenny@uiuc.edu				
kenny%cs@uiucvmd.bitnet				

Date: 6 Dec 89 02:17:14 GMT
From: osu-20.ircc.ohio-state.edu!bertsch-s@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Steve Bertsch)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <12547809688015@osu-20.ircc.ohio-state.edu>

Cast my vote for rec.ham-radio.tech. It seems that rec.ham-radio has turned into (or has been):

rec.ham,swl,scanner-radio.barf.pizza.ecpa.airport.argue.forever
Enough is enough of these endless legal debates. But if we must beat a subject to death on this net, how about at least picking a more technical (read radio-electronic) topic. Pick one-

Voltage vs. current baluns.
Tube vs. solid state final PA's.
Why are random noise pulses called static?

- or make up your own.

I'll start with question of my own. On 10 meters, from my QTH in central Ohio, I can only work stations that are about 2000 miles or more away from me, west coast, Europe, SA, Japan, but no south

east US, New England, etc. I'm using a 2 wavelength dipole that's one wavelength above ground. A friend suggested that if I lower the antenna, I'll raise the radiation angle and skip in closer. Anyone have any experience with this sort of thing? (I don't intend to lower my antenna, but I might build another one near the ground if this concept works.)

BTW, why IS random noise called static ??????

Date: 6 Dec 89 00:15:55 GMT
From: smcnet!lawrence@cs.ucla.edu (Lawrence Roney)
Subject: Motorola HT-600 Modifications
Message-ID: <385@smcnet.UUCP>

Has anyone ever found out how to convert the 2 channel Motorola HT-600 or Radius P-200 radios (same radio) to the six channel model? At first I thought the only difference was a metal stopper that prevented the switch from selecting channels 3 thru 6. When removed, the switch will move into those positions however the radio will still only TX and RX on channels 1 and 2. All of the leads from the switch appear to be connected to the CPU of the radio and I am able to program frequency and PL data into memory locations for channels 3-6. Is there anyone out there who knows if there is a jumper or diode or if it is burned into the CMOS EEPROM and needs to be changed with some other type of software to make this thing think that it has 6 channels instead of 2.

Lawrence Roney / Santa Monica College Telecommunications Department
Mail: uunet!ucla-cs!smcnet!lawrence
Voice: 213-452-9351

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #978
